

IC STAFF
Routing Slip

TO:	ACTION	COORD	INFO
EO/ICS			<i>[Signature]</i>
D/ICS			<i>[Signature]</i>
DD/ICS			<i>[Signature]</i>
DD/RE			<i>[Signature]</i>
EA-D/ICS			<i>[Signature]</i>
SA-D/ICS			<i>[Signature]</i>
SA-D/ICS-EP			
REO			
COMIREX			
SIGINT			
HUMINT			
MASINT			
IPC			
PBO			<i>X</i>
PPO			
CCISCMO			
IHC			
RDCO			
LL			
SECRETARIAT			
ADMIN			
REGISTRY			
		SUSPENSE: _____ Date	
REMARKS:			

5511X-1-SK



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS
WASHINGTON, DC 20350-2000

IN REPLY REFER TO
Ser 092/8U528810
10 August 1988

MEMO FOR DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (INTELLIGENCE)

Subj: MODULAR AUTOMATED INTELLIGENCE FUSION CENTER (MAIFC)

25X1

i. The MAIFC study briefed at the IMCG meeting 3 August provides useful background concerning what might be achieved in Joint Task Force support in an unconstrained budget environment. That, of course, is not the situation we now face.

2. I find the MAIFC study to be fundamentally flawed in several areas:

a. The study assumes we desire to process large volumes of non-organic raw sensor information afloat. While we need to send some uncorrelated data afloat, especially critical time-sensitive threat information, the large majority of data is better fused and processed ashore, whenever possible with analytic value added, and then passed to forward deployed units. Shore based fusion centers are more effective in dealing with large amounts of data, have far superior communications capabilities, are less costly and are more flexible to adapt to new requirements.

b. The proposal to place intelligence support and Task Force commanders on separate shipboard platforms flies in the face of long-accepted concepts of commander/intelligence interface procedures. A shipboard intelligence support node belongs on the command ship, with the commander and his key staff elements.

c. No requirement for a MAIFC-type capability has been stated by U&S commanders.

3. Over and above these concerns, several practical problems are apparent:

a. While deployment of the MAIFC would require a ship platform only in a wartime situation, Navy ships are built for and committed to warfighting. Indeed, wartime is the time in which Navy and Marine Corps could least afford diversion of amphibious ships.

b. Personnel requirements are not realistically addressed. The study ignores the fact that the normal ship's crew of approximately 470 would be removed from their primary warfighting mission.

c. The large number of aircraft required for transporting the MAIFC to its rendezvous with the ship would likely be committed to other roles in time of short-fuse buildup and deployment of forces.

4. A decision to proceed with MAIFC should be based on careful analysis of cost vs. potential gain. While tactical commanders could be well-served by dedicated support such as a MAIFC, in our present constrained budget environment, the anticipated return from providing that support afloat is not worth the projected cost.

5. Wiser investment would come from focused improvements aimed at extant problems in supporting task force commanders (e.g., inadequate communications to forward areas, including ships; inadequate display and correlation equipment; shortage of billets to adequately support deployable operational systems; shipboard grooming for better use of deployable support systems, such as JILE, TRIBUTARY and NMIST, etc.). I believe that an application of effort in these areas would be a better investment for improving support to a JTF or deployed commander than would be the large expenditures anticipated for a MAIFC. I fully support the concept of grooming ships to be able to accept certain JTF responsibilities. However, we must do it in the most cost effective and efficient way.



THOMAS A. BROOKS

RADM, USN

Director of Naval Intelligence

Copy to:

MG Wilson A. Shoffner, USA
LTG Sidney T. Weinstein, USA
RADM Geoffrey L. Chesbrough, USN
MG Anthony Burshnick
MG C. Norman Wood, USAF
BG James D. Beans, USMC
LTG Leonard H. Perroots, USAF
Mr. William P. Crowell
CAPT Charles E. Boehmer, USN
MG Robert F. Durkin, USAF

STAT